



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,303	01/04/2002	Laurent Labrunie	Q67909	1962

7590 12/03/2004
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

LEUNG, CHRISTINA Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2633

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/035,303	Applicant(s) LABRUNIE ET AL.	
	Examiner Christina Y. Leung	Art Unit 2633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02 Jan 2002</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

CL

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification should be divided into sections such as "Background of the Invention," "Summary of the Invention" and "Detailed Description of the Drawings" in accordance with current U.S. patent application practice. Also, a "Brief Description of the Drawings" section should be added.

Appropriate correction is required. Examiner respectfully reminds Applicants that no new matter may be introduced.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 and 3-6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1 and 3-6 each include numerical references in parentheses (such as "(10)" or "(12a, 12b)"); these references should be removed since they are not read as further limitations in the claims.

Additionally, claim 3 recites "characterized in that the the C-band" (sic) in lines 1 and 2 of the claim; Examiner respectfully suggests that Applicants amend the claim to remove the extra instance of the word "the."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Salameh et al. (US 6,614,567 B1) in view of Damen et al. (US 5,737,460 A).

Regarding claim 1, Al-Salameh et al. disclose an optical fiber transmission system (Figure 2), comprising

a transmitter terminal 220 launching an optical signal into a fiber line 275, the fiber line guiding the signal to a receiver terminal 225, the signal being composed of a multitude of bit-patterns at different wavelength channels within a given total bandwidth of wavelengths (output from the transmitting terminal), characterized in that the fiber line consists, in its first section, of at least two branches (the branches of fiber output from multiplexers 205 and 255 and input to multiplexer 281),

the transmitter launching into each one of the branches a separate part of the optical signal being composed of a sub-multitude of the bit-patterns at neighboring wavelength channels within non-overlapping bandwidth domains (Figure 2 shows wavelengths 1-M input into one of the branches, and wavelengths K-N input into the other branch; column 4, lines 49-61),

the parts of the signal being multiplexed together into one unique fiber by means of a multiplexer station 281 (column 5, lines 28-32).

Al-Salameh et al. do not specifically disclose that the multiplexer station is located not closer to the transmitter terminal such that the sum of the total optical powers guided by each of the branches plus the losses due to the multiplexing has decreased below the total optical power that is associated with a maximum optical power budget in the unique fiber guiding the full bandwidth of wavelengths.

However, it is well understood in the art, and Damen et al. particularly teach, that while the launch power of signals into a fiber should be high enough to ensure that they reach the receiving equipment at the other end, the launch power of the signals is limited by nonlinear optical effects that distort the signals (column 1, lines 14-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to ensure that the multiplexer station disclosed by Al-Salameh et al. is located in such a way as to ensure that the power of the output of the multiplexer station does not exceed the maximum optical power budget in the unique fiber guiding the full bandwidth of wavelengths as suggested by Damen et al. in order to prevent the occurrence of nonlinear optical effects and distortion in the fiber.

Regarding claim 2, Al-Salameh et al. disclose that the full bandwidth of wavelength is split into two domains (Figure 2 specifically shows two domains, wavelengths 1-M and wavelengths K-N).

Regarding claim 3, Al-Salameh et al. disclose that the C-band of approximately 1529-1562 nm and the L-band of approximately 1569-1604 nm are used as bandwidth domains launched into dedicated fiber branches (column 12, lines 12-18).

Art Unit: 2633

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ruffin (US 4,606,020 A).

Regarding claim 4, Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. describe a system as discussed above with regard to claim 1 including a fiber, but Al-Salameh et al. do not specifically further disclose that the two fiber branches are embedded in the same terrestrial fiber cable.

However, Ruffin teach a system related to the one described by Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. including wavelength division multiplexing signals onto a unique fiber (Figure 1; column 2, lines 36-50). Ruffin further teaches that two fiber branches (such as fibers 2-1 and 2-2) may be embedded in a same terrestrial fiber cable (bundled together within sheath 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to embed the two fiber branches in the system described by Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. as taught by Ruffin in order to transmit the two branches of signals along the same physical path and subsequently bring the signals on each branch together for multiplexing as already disclosed by Al-Salameh et al. One in the art would have been particularly motivated to combine the fiber cable taught by Ruffin with the system described by Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. in order to provide a compact and efficient means for multiplexing the signals (Ruffin, column 2, lines 55-59).

7. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kerfoot, III et al. (US 6,704,511 B1).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. describe a system as discussed above with regard to claim 1 including a fiber, but Al-Salameh et al. do not specifically further disclose that the unique fiber is embedded in a submarine fiber cable. However, Kerfoot, III, et al. teach a system related to the one described by Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al., including wavelength division multiplexing signals from a multiplexer station onto a unique fiber (Figure 3 shows multiplexer station 132 and fiber 106).

Kerfoot, III, et al. further particularly teach, that multiplexed optical signals may be sent along a submarine fiber cable (Kerfoot, III, et al.; Figures 1 and 3; column 1, lines 41-47; column 3, lines 15-28).

Kerfoot, III, et al. also teach that in the same system including a submarine fiber cable, the multiplexer station is situated close to a beach line (i.e., located on land close to the body of water, or in other words, a beach location; Figure 1 shows head end 130 while Figure 3 shows multiplexer 132 within head end 130).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill art to have the fiber in the system described by Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. be a submarine fiber cable as taught by Kerfoot, III, et al., and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill art to have the multiplexer station in the system described by Al-Salameh et al. in view of Damen et al. be situated close to a beach line as taught by Kerfoot, III et al., in order to arrange the communications system for transmitting long distances across a body of water and communicate signals between particular locations as desired by users.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christina Y. Leung whose telephone number is 571-272-3023. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on 571-272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christina Y Leung
Christina Y Leung
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2633